

September 3 2013

FILED

2013 SEP -5 A 10: 06

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
E.D. MICHIGAN-DETROIT

To :Honorable Steven W. Rhodes
C/O Clerk of the Court:

From: Keith Maddox-EI #186273
G. Robert Cotton Correctional Facility
3510 N. Elm Street
Jackson,, MI. 49201-8877

Re: In re City of Detroit,Michigan Case No. 13-53846

Your Honor:

I am a layman in the law, and I have filed a civil complaint against the City of Detroit.

The Attorney for the People of the City of Detroit has informed this writer this matter is pending before your Court under stay.

That under Section 363 and 902 of the Bankruptcy Code this Court with not allow The City of Detroit to answer this writer/Plaintiff claim pending in the 30th Judicial Circuit of the State of Michigan per City Attorney.

When the People of the City of Detroit was service and well aware of the Notice of Intend Filed in May 2013 with the City of Detroit [well before the thought of Bankruptcy being filed] and now under dkt 13-802-CZ

The Attorney for the City of Detroit state that case no. 13-53846 is under automatic stay, and that this Plaintiff can not proceed, commence or continue any cause of action against the City, or it employees,officers or inhabitants and may not be prosecuted and no valid judgment or order may be entered or enforced against the City of Detroit, [b]ecause this Court will not allow this action to continue i.e., 13-802-CZ in State Court!

Could you please sent this writer a copy of this Order to Stay. Because it is to

the Plaintiff under stand under Chapter 11 § 362 (8) (b) " the filing of a petition under section 301, 302 or 303 of this title, or of an application under section 5(a)(3) of the Securies investor protection act of 1970, does not operate as a stay-- nor stopping the City of Detroit from Answering or being held accountable for Civil Complaint under Case Number 13-802-CZ.

Unlike situation where the debtor is the Defendant in litigation, the Automatic Stay provision of the Bankruptcy code does not freeze litigation where the debtor is the Plaintiff.

Is this court running any interference, stopping or delaying this Plaintiff from commence or continue litigation that stated in May 2013 [with Notice of Intent] against the City of Detroit ? Please provide direct answer in layman term. Because the City of Detroit is saying you are.

Your answer/conformation is greatly needed as the Plaintiff/Writer is under time restraints and would like to be timely. Pursuant to Michigan Court Rules, being a layman in law require more time for the Plaintiff to prepare seeing that Attorney have been trained and have other to assist...

However, if in deed the Attorney for the City of Detroit is being deceiving, misleading or compelling fraud upon the court and record. Plaintiff move that this Attorney to be held accountable pursuant to Profession Rules of Conduct...

Respectfully requesting,



PROOF OF SERVICE

On September 3, 2013, I served the foregoing paper by U.S. Mail upon the Defendant's Attorney James D. Noseda at his address of record by placing the same in U.S. Mail per Expedited Legal Mail-Prisoner. I declare that the foregoing statement is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

/s/  Keith Maddox-El